

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01128 011159Z

46

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ACDA-19 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 CIAE-00

PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01

SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAM-01 SAJ-01 H-03 NSC-10

SS-20 OMB-01 EB-11 DRC-01 /176 W

----- 079876

R 011040Z MAR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4347

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 1128

E.O. 11652: GDS 12-31-80

TAGS: MCAP, NATO

SUBJECT: DPC MEETING, FEBRUARY 28: NATO FORCE PROPOSALS/GOALS

REF: (A) STATE 30893; (B) USNATO 0772; (C) USNATO 0404;

(D) USNATO 1069

BEGIN SUMMARY: DURING ITS FEB 28 MEETING (POSTPONED FROM FEB 27) DPC CONSIDERED MILITARY COMMITTEE (MC) FORCE PROPOSALS 1975-80. SYG LUNS NOTED THAT ALLIANCE FORCE GOALS SHOULD NOT ONLY MAKE SENSE AS COHERENT MILITARY STRUCTURE, BUT SHOULD ALSO BE ACCEPTED AS REALISTIC AND REASONABLE BASIS FOR NATIONAL FORCE PLANNING. RUMSFELD DREW ON REF (A) IN STRESSING ONCE AGAIN IMPORTANCE TO NATO OF PROCESS OF DEVELOPING FORCE GOALS. END SUMMARY.

1. IN INTRODUCING SUBJECT, SYG LUNS DREW ATTENTION TO EXCHANGE BETWEEN RUMSFELD AND HIMSELF (REF (B) AND (C)), AND ASKED FOR DISCUSSION OF POINTS RAISED THERE.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01128 011159Z

MC REP (ADM MINTER), IN COMMENTING ON MC FORCE PROPOSALS, SAID THERE PARTICULAR PROPOSALS HAD UNDERGONE MUCH GREATER SCRUTINY, AND MORE DISCUSSION WITH NATIONS, THAN HAD PREVIOUSLY BEEN THE CASE. HE CALLED ATTENTION TO OPPORTU-

NITIES FOR STANDARDIZATION IN PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT CALLED FOR IN PROPOSALS, PARTICULARLY IN F-104 REPLACEMENT, MINE COUNTER-MEASURE VESSELS FOR THE CHANNEL COMMAND, AND ELECTRONIC SUPPORT EQUIPMENT. HE NOTED THAT THE PROPOSALS WOULD UNDERGO FURTHER REFINEMENT IN THE DRC, BUT RECOMMENDED ACCEPTANCE OF THE MC FORCE PROPOSALS AS A BASIS FOR PLANNING.

2. UK (PECK) AGREED THAT FORCE PROPOSALS/GOALS PROCESS IS IMPORTANT AND SAID UK WOULD JOIN IN EFFORT TO MAKE THAT PROCESS MORE USEFUL. HE GENERALLY SUPPORTED SYG'S REPLY TO RUMSFELD LETTER, AND EMPHASIZED THAT DRC SHOULD IDENTIFY BOTH EXTENT TO WHICH FORCE PROPOSALS REFLECT CURRENT COUNTRY PLANS AND TO WHICH THEY ARE REAL CALL FOR EXTRA RESOURCES. ITALY (CATALANO) EXPRESSED APPRECIATION FOR RUMSFELD/SYG EXCHANGE OF LETTERS, AND THOUGHT THAT TOGETHER THEY PROVIDED SOUND GUIDANCE FOR TRANSLATING FORCE PROPOSALS INTO GOALS.

3. U.S. (RUMSFELD) DREW ON REF (A) IN EMPHASIZING IMPORTANT TASK ALLIANCE FACES IN DEVELOPING FORCE GOALS TO GUIDE PLANNING FOR NEXT TWO YEARS. IN ADDITION TO SPECIFIC POINTS MADE IN REF (A), HE SUGGESTED DRC SHOULD IDENTIFY THOSE PROPOSALS WHICH NATIONS INDICATE THEY ARE UNWILLING OR UNABLE TO IMPLEMENT. DPC COULD THEN ASK NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES IF ANY OF THE ITEMS IN THAT GROUP ARE SO ESSENTIAL THAT POSSIBLE REDUCTIONS SHOULD BE MADE IN OTHER GOALS OR GOALS SHOULD BE EXCHANGED BETWEEN COUNTRIES IN ORDER TO AVOID AN UNACCEPTABLE WEAKNESS IN NATO'S COLLECTIVE DEFENSES. RUMSFELD (SUPPORTED BY SYG LUNS) LAID PARTICULAR STRESS ON LOW COST/NO COST MEASURES, AND THE NEED FOR DPC TO IDENTIFY THEM IN A WAY WHICH WILL BRING TO ATTENTION OF NATIONAL AUTHORITIES WITH FULL WEIGHT OF THE ALLIANCE THE DIFFICULT POLITICAL DECISIONS WHICH CAPITALS MAY HAVE TO TAKE TO IMPLEMENT THEM.

4. ASYG HUMPHREYS CALLED ATTENTION TO FACT THAT DRC HAS SET UP WORK PROGRAM FOR CONSIDERATION OF FORCE PROPOSALS (REF (D)), WILL BREAK OUT COSTS TO EXTENT POSSIBLE, AND WILL CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01128 011159Z

SEEK TO IDENTIFY LOW COST/NO COST MEASURES, AS WELL AS THOSE CALLING FOR POSSIBLE STANDARDIZATION. HE SAID THAT DRC WOULD TRY TO MEET POINTS RAISED BY RUMSFELD. MC REP (ADM MINTER) SAID GEN. STEINHOFF AGREES WITH THRUST OF APPROACH SET OUT IN RUMSFELD LETTER, RECOGNIZES THAT MC FORCE PROPOSALS ARE NOT ACHIEVABLE, AND THAT MC REPS LOOK FORWARD TO PARTICIPATING IN DRC DISCUSSIONS OF SUBJECT. HE SUPPORTED RUMSFELD IN URGING THAT FORCE GOALS SHOULD ALLOW FOR NO GAPS IN ALLIED FORCE STRUCTURE.

5. SYG CONCLUDED DISCUSSION BY SAYING THAT DRC WILL NOW BEGIN EXAMINATION OF FORCE GOALS FROM A NON-MILITARY POINT OF VIEW, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL FACTORS

AS WELL, AND WILL BE GUIDED BY THE RUMSFELD-LUNS EXCHANGE OF
LETTERS. DRC IS EXPECTED TO RECOMMEND NEW FORCE GOALS IN
ABOUT SIX WEEKS, WHICH HE HOPED WOULD GIVE A REALISTIC AND
REASONABLE BASIS FOR ALLIED PLANNING.
RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 01 MAR 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO01128
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS 12-31-80
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740381/abbrytnf.tel
Line Count: 115
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) STATE 30893; (B) USNATO 0772; (C) USNATO 0404; (D) USNATO 1069
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 09 APR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <09 APR 2002 by ifshinsr>; APPROVED <30-Aug-2002 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DPC MEETING, FEBRUARY 28: NATO FORCE PROPOSALS/GOALS
TAGS: MCAF, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT
CINCLANT
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

